

THE CATHOLIC MIND

VOL. XL

FEBRUARY 22, 1942

No. 940

Political Catholicism

CARDINAL VAN ROEY

Reprinted from THE TABLET, London.

The following are the principal passages from the address delivered by the Archbishop of Malines and Primate of Belgium, at a Congress of the Belgian Young Christian Workers.

FIRST of all there is the physical evil—what a mass of ruin, what a slaughter of human lives. Every day and every night thousands of precious lives are destroyed in the air, on the earth, on the ocean and under the sea, all over Europe and perhaps tomorrow throughout the entire world. When in our imagination we picture these sufferings we feel overwhelmed—and what privations of every kind are being endured by those who are still alive. In many places there is famine and the diseases that come from it.

Then there is moral evil: sins of warfare insofar as it is unjust. The invasion of a country such as ours is clearly contrary to every law of justice. This war is in itself a tremendous crime. And we must add to it all the sins that come in its train. All the sins against human and Divine laws, all the violations of natural law. It is moral evil in all its horror . . .

CHURCH WILL EMERGE VICTORIOUS

We are certain that the Church will emerge victorious from all the difficulties that face her. But we must understand exactly what we mean: we are speaking of the Church as a whole. We are speaking of the Catholic Church throughout the centuries which has survived persecution and all the disasters that can strike the human race. But we do not mean the Catholic Church in any one country. The Divine promise as such contains no guarantee that the Catholic Church will always be preserved in Belgium, in France or in any particular country. This mistake is often made: to maintain this is to contradict history.

We have only to glance at the history of Europe to see at once that the promise of unbroken existence was not made to the Church of any particular country, however Catholic or Christian it might be . . .

We must not, then, say that we are certain of remaining Catholic simply because our Lord made solemn promises to His Church, but I think we may say that a collection of countries can feel the assurance and the certainty of preserving their Catholic life. I cannot, for example, imagine how Divine Providence could allow the Catholic Church to be abolished in Europe—that body of countries which has been the home of the Catholic Church for nineteen centuries. When I think of that I cannot see how God would allow any persecuting regime to control these countries which would suppress the influence of the Catholic Church. In this thought there is a strong reason for confidence.

Here I would mention an argument which one meets in many places and which is current in the Press of today. Certain people, and even certain Catholics, say that for the Church as a whole the fate of our country after the war and the Government we should have, matter little: for, they argue, the Church adapts her-

self to all forms of government. What are we to say to this argument?

LIBERTY OF CONSCIENCE

Clearly we must define our terms. The Catholic Church adapts itself to all governments on condition that they safeguard her liberty of conscience: that is true. But as for adapting herself to governments that oppress the rights of conscience and persecute the Catholic Church—no, never!

And I would add that the Governments which are more or less tolerable, and to which the Church can adapt herself, are very varied. There are some more favorable and some less favorable. The Church is essentially indifferent whether she lives under a monarchy or under a republic or in a democratic or autocratic government. There is an endless variety of governments. Democratic monarchy, autocratic monarchy, democratic republic, autocratic republic, etc. France, Italy, Belgium, America, all have different regimes, but if these regimes safeguard and maintain the rights of the Church and allow her to fulfil her Divine mission, that is to say, to work as far as possible for the salvation of souls, then the Church accepts these Governments, does not oppose them, and adapts her work to them.

But it is clearly impossible for the Church to accept all forms of government. We have only to study history: did the Church adapt herself to Mohammedanism? She was completely suppressed in all countries where it was dominant. Did the Church adapt herself to the persecuting governments in England up to the end of the eighteenth century? She was effaced from England. Would the Church have adapted herself to the French Revolution? This regime only lasted ten years but if it had continued the Church would have been suppressed in every country where the revolution raged.

Could the Church adapt herself to the Governments in Russia and Mexico? No! Could she do so now in the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg, where at this very moment students and nuns are being expelled and where Catholic schools have ceased to exist? No!

CHURCH CAN'T ACCEPT ALL GOVERNMENTS

It is, then, absolutely false to say that the Church can accept all governments. The Church is like the human organism. Man can live in the glacial cold of the north as in the torrid heat of the equator, but there are places to which he cannot acclimatize himself and where he dies for want of air. He can get used to all kinds of changes of diet, but there are some that kill him.

The Church has experience of Governments which respect absolute liberty, the laws of conscience and the rights of the Church, and of those which are less favorable though tolerable.

In America there is a complete separation between Church and State, but there is also complete liberty: Catholic life flourishes magnificently. Italy, Portugal and Germany have authoritarian governments, but there is an enormous difference between them. Our country, Holland, and France have regimes acceptable to the Church; but it must be admitted that there is a considerable difference as to the profit which she derives from them for the salvation of souls.

The Church desires the most favorable regime and encourages Catholics to work for that end. It is unlawful for Catholics to help introduce into a country a form of government which persecutes and oppresses the rights of the Church. Catholics are bound to see that the government that the Church is to accept is the one most favorable to her spiritual work . . .

It is sometimes maintained that the role of the Church is as follows: to teach the Faith, to administer

the Sacraments and to maintain Church services: all the rest belongs to political Catholicism. Therefore, if we have a government which restricts the actions of the Hierarchy and the clergy by limiting their influence, it does not matter very much! One would only be obeying the words of our Lord: "Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's." That is to say, give the State what belongs to the State and leave to God what belongs to God; those who work in the domain of religion may not trespass on the domain of the State.

CHURCH HAS MISSION TO TEACH WHOLE TRUTH

What is our answer to this? Is there any need to say that we fully accept the word of our Lord: the Church has always maintained this principle, but we must obviously understand its real meaning. According to this maxim, the Church claims for herself what belongs to God. And clearly what belongs to God is the Gospel and all the Gospel; it is the truth contained in the Gospel, all the truth; it is the moral teaching of the Gospel, all the moral teaching.

Our Lord has given to those who represent the Church the mission of teaching its truth and its moral laws to mankind. He left the sacred trust with the Church for her to keep intact, for her to defend against those who try to diminish it. It is not true, therefore, that the function of the Church is limited to services and to the administration of the Sacraments; she is entrusted with the teaching of the whole of the evangelical truths and evangelical ethics.

We must add, too, that the Church has the right to do this by all natural means, that is to say, by all the means that have been given by God to men. Why should there be means belonging to nature which the Church shall not use? It is an essential point: modern inventions created by human genius are not an excep-

tion to this rule; they should be at the service of the whole world, to the Church as well as to the State. It is not only oral teaching but also the written word, and especially the Press, which ought to be at the service of Catholics as well as non-Catholics. It is the radio, the movies, and, in a general way, teaching in schools and colleges and all that this teaching comprises. The Church claims this for herself, but this is not political Catholicism . . .

The Church, then, has not only the mission of celebrating Mass and administering the Sacraments and ensuring that the word of God is preached, but she has, together with parents, the mission of educating youth both morally and scholastically. She has the right of defending the Faith and Christian morality against hostile propaganda. Catholics have the right to profess, teach, defend and practise the Catholic Faith and Catholic principles in all domains, not only individually, but also in the family, in the State, in public and international life and by every means at the disposal of mankind.

THE CHURCH AND POLITICS

What do we mean, especially in Belgium, when we speak of political Catholicism? What have people in their minds when they bring it up as a grievance against the clergy and the Hierarchy?

Is it the Catholic Party as we have known it? Well then, my answer is that the Catholic Party is not a derivative of the Catholic Church; it is a political organization created and maintained by Catholics in their capacity as Belgian citizens. Catholics were free and are free along with other citizens to organize their political actions as they understand them: they are authorized to do this both by the natural and the civil law. They have a political program, as every self-respecting political party ought to have, but they

also include in that program the defense of the rights of the Church, and it was precisely this which legalized and made necessary the existence of the Party and its activities. This Party was the outcome of an historical need born of the necessity of fighting against the Freemasons, who were represented in 1940 by the Liberals; no one could have resisted their anti-religious policy if the Catholic Party had not existed, worked and struggled during the nineteenth century and the first part of the twentieth. Without it what would have happened to the Catholic Church in Belgium? The struggle over the schools in 1879 could never have taken place — that magnificent struggle which they fought on the political and public field in defence of the rights of the Church as well as the rights of the parents.

But the Church did not organize this Party and never interfered with it. It is, therefore, true to say that the Church, that is to say, the clergy and the Hierarchy and even the Papacy, have always impressed upon Belgian citizens the duty of voting for those who defend Catholic principles against those who attack them; this duty of conscience is self-evident, it is taught in all moral theology.

It is then an historical necessity that created the Catholic Party in Belgium, but it might well be an accidental need. It is possible that tomorrow this historical necessity may no longer exist if a Government different from the one we have known comes into power. We can easily conceive a government under which this necessity would no longer exist. In Portugal, for example, there is no Catholic Party, for the Government does not make it necessary for the rights of the Church to be defended.

POLITICAL CATHOLICS?

When one speaks of political Catholics what has one in mind? Is it Catholic activities or is it Catholic

education? But that appertains to the essential mission of the Church. She will never give up that right, for the Church has the right to teach the Faith; more than that, she has the right and the duty of seeing that in the institutions where the secular sciences are taught, the atmosphere is wholesome and the education Christian. That is the reason for Catholic schools.

Do they mean works of charity? but to perform works of charity is the first precept of our Lord. Do they mean Catholic Action? but that is the apostolate of the Hierarchy and the clergy extended to the laity. Those who attack this so-called political Catholicism have all this in mind. The Church will always claim the right of teaching, preaching and practising charity, that is to say, the right of fulfilling her apostolic mission. She will regard any regime that suppresses these things as oppressive. To suppress these things is to oppress her greatest saints . . .

When therefore people attack political Catholicism they are attacking the doctrinal principles which she teaches and which she applies to every branch of life even outside the strictly religious sphere.

Moreover, the Church claims, and should claim, the right to teach those moral principles which govern life, not only the individual and private life of every person, but also the life of the family, the society and the State. The heads of States, kings and the mightiest emperors are subject like all other men to the Divine and natural law. Like all men and like all statesmen they are subject to these laws in every sphere and in all their actions, both in the political, national and international domains.

FULFILLING THE APOSTOLATE

The Church will never renounce her right of proclaiming the truth and showing what is just and unjust, of defining and defending the rights and

duties of individuals as well as families and States. To refuse her this right would be quite clearly to suppress a great part of the Church's activity: in proof of this, it is only necessary to consider for a moment what the last Popes have done.

The Encyclical *Immortale Dei* of Leo XIII deals with the constitution of States. The Encyclicals *Rerum Novarum* of Leo XIII and *Quadragesimo Anno* of Pius XI deal with social and economic questions. All this is not strictly religious and yet no one can deny the Papacy the right of dealing with such subjects.

Pius XI issued an Encyclical on marriage, *Casti Connubii*. This again is not strictly a religious matter. He speaks in it of the duty of families of husbands and wives and parents and the rights of the State. In the same way he issued an Encyclical on the Christian education of Youth, which again is not strictly a religious matter. Again in this sphere he speaks of the rights and duties of the State. Pius XI, in 1937, wrote the Encyclical *Mit brennender Sorge* in which he both judges and condemns National Socialism; at the same time he issued the Encyclical *Divini Redemptoris* in which he condemns Bolshevistic Communism. All these matters are not strictly matters of the Faith; they do not concern religious services or the administration of the Sacraments, and yet in all these fields the Church is on her own territory and claims the right of judging, not from the political but from the moral standpoint, the actions of men and those who rule the world.

All these observations unfortunately may only provoke attacks on the liberty of the Church and on the rights of conscience, and so Catholics ought to open their eyes; and I say so now. You have the opportunity of fulfilling the apostolate of the Church and I beseech you to spread the ideas that I have just expounded by all the means at your disposal.

Conversion of the Jews

RT. REV. MSGR. THOMAS J. McDONNELL

Reprinted from THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

AMONG Catholics there is always an element of mystery as to why, after over nineteen centuries, there are relatively few conversions to Catholicism among the Jews.

Actually there should be little difficulty for the really sincere and well-intentioned Jew to take such a step, since every phase of Christ's life had been foretold to the people of Israel and His advent was expected by the Romans and peoples of other lands. Herod, proud in his kingship over Judea, had no hesitancy in appealing to the scribes concerning the birth of the Child Whom the Wisemen had "come to adore." Nor was there any delay in the answer given the Roman King, for the assembled priests and scribes of the people informed him that "the Christ," the king of the Jews was to be born "in Bethlehem of Judea." Thus it would seem that the reasons given by Hugh Angress for his own conversion from Judaism should apply to others as well. "I am a Catholic because I am a Jew," he writes. "To me, from Christ to the Catholic Church is like from Judaism to Christ. I accept Christ because I am a Jew, and I accept the Church because I accept Christ."

THE DANGERS OF INDIFFERENCE

Unfortunately during the past centuries, particularly the twentieth, a spirit of indifference toward religion has developed among the Jewish people, especially the younger generation. Here in America with our democratic institutions, young men and women of the Jewish race have become infiltrated with the godless philosophies expounded in our secular high

schools, colleges and universities. In many instances the religious exercises carefully followed by their parents and grandparents have deteriorated into affairs of indifference to them. They have replaced the teachings of Judaism with beliefs of pseudo-scientific sophists who from the depths of their agnosticism and atheism tear down the structure of both the Mosaic and Christian laws.

On the other hand we must remember that in possibly no nation on the face of the earth are the Jews allowed the liberty and shown the justice they enjoy in these United States. For centuries they have been viewed with disfavor in some of the most Christian of European nations; governmental restrictions have specified the locality of their dwellings, the schools which they might attend; in some instances, the very professions in which they might engage. Even in those lands where such rules did not exist the deification of aryanism has once more made them wanderers upon the face of the earth.

THE HOUR HAS STRUCK

Harassed by war, penniless, and in great numbers, homeless, it would seem that this might be an opportune time to enlist the help of heaven for the entrance of the Jewish people into the True Fold. Added to our prayers we should also include the aid of a truly Christian charity towards them as well as an understanding of their needs, remembering at all times that "Catholicism is Judaism in flower—Judaism fulfilled." It might be well to recall with what fidelity the Redeemer Himself, as well as His Mother, His foster father fulfilled the requirements of the Old Law and that He confided the ministry of His Church to His Jewish followers. "The twelve Apostles, the seventy-two disciples, Mary, Martha, Lazarus, Joseph of Arimathea and Nicodemus were all Jews. The first

teachers and converts, the first martyrs, confessors, widows and virgins were Jewish converts, while the first Bishop of Jerusalem, Saint James, and fourteen of his successors were Hebrew Christians." (Dom Maternus Spitz)

There is a consoling factor regarding conversions from Judaism—they are marked by a deep faith and sincerity of purpose, to which is added zeal for the enrollment of their fellowmen. The pages of history give many instances of such conversions—the nineteenth century offering some splendid examples among which are the Ratisbonne brothers with their world-embracing faith and fervor. The Society for the Propagation of the Faith and the missions under its care, owes a deep debt of gratitude to a "Jew who became a Christian, a priest and founder of a religious community," Francis Libermann. Fired with deep understanding of the needs of the Negroes, he was inspired to found a congregation of priests to labor for the conversion of Africa, and won the approval of the Holy See for his project. In 1841 the novitiate of the Missionaries of the Holy Heart of Mary was opened. Later this Society was united with the Congregation of the Holy Ghost, which, having suffered so severely during the French Revolution, rose to new heights of zeal and service when given the young blood of the new community founded by Francis Libermann.

Certainly there is ample reason to feel that there is a whitening for the harvest among the millions of souls who still adhere to Judaism.

* * *

Only 15,000 of the 900,000 volumes of Louvain University Library remain, reports the Independent Belgian Agency. Out of 800 manuscripts only fifteen escaped the fire when the Germans invaded Belgium. The Library was also destroyed in 1914.

Security and Concord of the Americas

REV. JAMES A. MAGNER

Condensed from Pan American sermon delivered at a Mass offered in St. Patrick's Church, Washington, D. C., November 20, 1941, for the security and concord of the Americas.

THE Americas cover an enormous territory. They are separated by geographic differences of mountain, plain, jungle, ocean, by climate, and by every natural hazard. In historic origin, racial and national development, traditional culture, religion, and contemporary outlooks, they present a wide diversity. But all, however far-flung or diverse, can come together, with sovereign rights unimpaired and national aspirations glorified, beneath the shadow of the universal cross of Jesus Christ.

This spiritual unity of the Americas is their birth-right and greatest heritage. Whatever there is of nobility in the New World owes its existence to a spiritual ideal and to the labors of spiritual men. Mixed motives, it is true, have driven men across the face of the earth and been responsible for the final shape of society.

There is much to indicate that the impact of European civilization upon the Indian natives of the Americas was accompanied with blood and oppression. All history, unfortunately, is stained with this. But besides the economic impulse, the lust for power, the shadowy forms of bigotry, that have been publicized so much and used reciprocally to blacken our national scutcheons, there runs the golden thread and background of noble desire spun from the realization that we are the sons of God and the heirs of heaven.

Such constructive work as was done, in education, civilization, and the progress of morals, was achieved

under the inspiration of Christ. And where brutality and oppression showed their hand, it was the steady-ing and restraining power of religion that called men back to a sense of justice and defended the rights of the oppressed.

In this process of forging the nations of the Americas and providing them with a forward and upward vision, the Catholic Church takes a most justifiable pride. Its policy, like that of Christ, has been one of the greatest possible humanity, penetrating ahead of all others for souls, binding up the wounds of the sick and injured, teaching the friendly arts, stressing the formation of community and social as well as private virtues, reproving the evil, and teaching the ways of salvation, and this without counting the cost in personal sacrifice. This is true, wherever the Church has set foot, and not merely in the beginning or in remote times, but in every difficult step of the way—in the sixteenth, seventeenth, eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth centuries.

Our beginnings are steeped in this tradition, so that one may truly say the Americas have been cradled in Catholicism. This Catholicism, it must be pointed out, was not merely of a casual character. It was a missionary Catholicism, militantly engaged in the work of spiritual conversion and betterment and in the establishment of a genuinely Christian society.

Mere mention of the names of Marquette, and of the North American martyrs, Saints Isaac Jogues, Lalemant, and the rest, and of later men of God like Bishop Baraga and Mazzuchelli is suggestive of the epocal character of the introduction of Christianity. These men were not fanatics. They were scholars, Christian humanists, historians, and linguists in the highest traditions of the Old World. To run down the list would be a task of staggering proportions.

To assume, as has become the mode in certain schools of history, that subsequent action of the Church

was summed up in mediocrity and empty aggrandizement, would be as ridiculous as to assert that English literature died with Shakespeare and Spanish literature with Cervantes. The work of evangelization, of education, and of charity went on unabated, wherever it was not stopped by hostile forces, throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

Great universities, the Press, scientific development, and social uplift were the glory of all Ibero-America long before the British colonies of America were able to boast of similar achievements.

A tremendous set-back was given to all Spanish countries in 1767, when the Pragmatic Sanction of Charles III ordered the expulsion of the Jesuit Order, as evidenced by the fact that in Mexico alone this meant the suspension of over 4,000 centers of education and philanthropy. But these self-same attacks, if properly studied, bring into greater relief popular affection for the spiritual forces and values that had given character and stability to the life of those centuries.

It was inevitable and easily understandable that during the movements for independence in the early nineteenth century, a certain amount of political confusion and division should characterize segments of the Church as well as of the State. Nevertheless, as the Catholics of France had earlier rallied to the cause of independence for the British colonies of North America, and the Catholics under the inspiration of John and Charles Carroll had pledged their lives and fortunes to the cause, under none too easy circumstances, so did leading clerics throughout Ibero-America, in the belief that they were preserving spiritual benefits, join with Bolivar, San Martin, O'Higgins and the other great patriots of independence.

It is important also to note, in passing, the efforts made by the Latin-American republics to try to re-awaken political contacts with Rome and to pledge

under the inspiration of Christ. And where brutality and oppression showed their hand, it was the steady-
ing and restraining power of religion that called men
back to a sense of justice and defended the rights of
the oppressed.

In this process of forging the nations of the Americas and providing them with a forward and upward vision, the Catholic Church takes a most justifiable pride. Its policy, like that of Christ, has been one of the greatest possible humanity, penetrating ahead of all others for souls, binding up the wounds of the sick and injured, teaching the friendly arts, stressing the formation of community and social as well as private virtues, reproving the evil, and teaching the ways of salvation, and this without counting the cost in personal sacrifice. This is true, wherever the Church has set foot, and not merely in the beginning or in remote times, but in every difficult step of the way—in the sixteenth, seventeenth, eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth centuries.

Our beginnings are steeped in this tradition, so that one may truly say the Americas have been cradled in Catholicism. This Catholicism, it must be pointed out, was not merely of a casual character. It was a missionary Catholicism, militantly engaged in the work of spiritual conversion and betterment and in the establishment of a genuinely Christian society.

Mere mention of the names of Marquette, and of the North American martyrs, Saints Isaac Jogues, Lalemant, and the rest, and of later men of God like Bishop Baraga and Mazzuchelli is suggestive of the epocal character of the introduction of Christianity. These men were not fanatics. They were scholars, Christian humanists, historians, and linguists in the highest traditions of the Old World. To run down the list would be a task of staggering proportions.

To assume, as has become the mode in certain schools of history, that subsequent action of the Church

was summed up in mediocrity and empty aggrandizement, would be as ridiculous as to assert that English literature died with Shakespeare and Spanish literature with Cervantes. The work of evangelization, of education, and of charity went on unabated, wherever it was not stopped by hostile forces, throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

Great universities, the Press, scientific development, and social uplift were the glory of all Ibero-America long before the British colonies of America were able to boast of similar achievements.

A tremendous set-back was given to all Spanish countries in 1767, when the Pragmatic Sanction of Charles III ordered the expulsion of the Jesuit Order, as evidenced by the fact that in Mexico alone this meant the suspension of over 4,000 centers of education and philanthropy. But these self-same attacks, if properly studied, bring into greater relief popular affection for the spiritual forces and values that had given character and stability to the life of those centuries.

It was inevitable and easily understandable that during the movements for independence in the early nineteenth century, a certain amount of political confusion and division should characterize segments of the Church as well as of the State. Nevertheless, as the Catholics of France had earlier rallied to the cause of independence for the British colonies of North America, and the Catholics under the inspiration of John and Charles Carroll had pledged their lives and fortunes to the cause, under none too easy circumstances, so did leading clerics throughout Ibero-America, in the belief that they were preserving spiritual benefits, join with Bolivar, San Martin, O'Higgins and the other great patriots of independence.

It is important also to note, in passing, the efforts made by the Latin-American republics to try to re-awaken political contacts with Rome and to pledge

their devotion and spiritual union to the Papacy, after the shock of the wars of independence and severance from the ecclesiastical organization of Spain.

Subsequent events did not appear to bring the desired fruits of spiritual freedom within the respective countries of the Western Hemisphere. In the United States, a wave of "nativist" movements broke out under the banner of false patriotism to make life for Catholics as difficult as possible. Similar activity manifested itself throughout Ibero-America, likewise representing Catholicism as a foreign institution inimical to true progress.

While Catholicism grew by force of numbers and leadership to give an ever fuller measure of its vigor to the national life of the United States, the reverse was frequently true in the Spanish and Portuguese speaking Americas. Laws, political maneuvering, and intellectual badgering all but extinguished the vitality of the Church. Cultural traditions and foundations of the past were despised, and spiritual disunity within the nations became a chronic source of disorder and intrigue.

So far as spiritual unity of the Americas is concerned, it must be admitted that during the colonial era there was precious little in common between what may be designated as Anglo-America and Ibero-America. The Spanish-British conflict for imperial power and the British-Protestant versus Spanish-Catholic antagonism gave rise to a series of unhappy traditions that still delay the way to perfect understanding and unity of spirit.

The nineteenth century and part of the twentieth witnessed something of a cultural, and partly political, kinship among international elements, not always friendly to the predominance or development of Catholic ideals in North or South America. On the other hand, it is interesting to note that when the eminent Archbishop of Bogotá, Colombia, Doctor Manual José

de Mosquera, was banished by a hostile senate in 1852, he was given hospitality by his correligionists of New York during his sojourn there, en route to Europe.

Developments of the last decade point to a more comprehensive and positive approach to spiritual understanding. Within the Ibero-American nations, the fierce legal assault of the past against the Church and the cynical attitude of various intellectuals with respect to religious faith are giving way to the realization that the Church properly understood is a bulwark of free institutions and that religion, as the link between man and God, is the only solid foundation of character and civic morality.

There has been a notable return on the part of outstanding statesmen and scholars, not merely to a public profession of faith, but also to a sincere and devout practice of their religion. Leading men and women, in public and private positions, throughout Central and South America are devoting themselves to the betterment of their people on the same basis and motive of religious inspiration.

Certain forces in the United States still cling to the idea that no progress can come to Central and South America until Catholicism has been supplanted with some other religion or religions or been extirpated in favor of some general code of sociological or material development, and until the last vestiges of Spanish culture have been replaced with something more Nordic in character.

There is a growing realization on the part of intelligent observers of all faiths, however, that the religious and vitalizing faith of Ibero-America, indeed the spiritual link of the Americas, is Catholicism, that to hold this up to scorn is to offend the proudest and most ancient heritage of our "Good Neighbors" and to re-kindle the flames of confusion and internecine struggle that brought weakness and disintegration in the past.

It is our responsibility to recognize these facts and to see to it that the representatives from the United States to the countries of Latin America be men of the highest calibre, morally and intellectually. Nothing less will do, and nothing less will satisfy the aspirations of our own State Department and of the Coordinating Committees, working so splendidly in the task of inter-American understanding and cooperation.

At the same time, the Government of the United States, while professing no religion in particular, has gone to great lengths in proclaiming religious freedom as a cardinal point of democracy and the necessity of religious foundations as demonstrated by right reason. It would therefore seem that the moment has come for the international relationships of the nations of the Western Hemisphere to rise to a spiritual level and to aspire to an integrity dominated by spiritual ideals. As a matter of fact, this challenge has been put forth by various countries and spokesmen, albeit in different terms and with various concepts.

Thus, referring to an exchange of goods between the United States and his country, a certain statesman recently declared: "The effect of these closer trade relations upon the future political relations of our peoples will depend upon the spirit of cooperation they show in placing a genuine coordination of interests above the mere quest of profits."

The spirit of cooperation, however, must rest upon more profound conceptions of the rights and duties of men and nations before God, if it is not again to degenerate into a sly quest of profits. Even democracy itself, held aloft as the ideal and hope of human rights, can end in a welter of power politics, selfish intrigue, and brute force, unless it is founded on the principle that all authority stems from God, that it is limited by the moral law, and that it carries a responsibility of respecting the inherent rights of nations other than the people over which it is specifically exercised.

The time has come for us individually and collectively to ask honestly whether our aspirations for Inter-American cooperation and the democracy we extol and propose to protect are resting on solid Christian principles or whether we are off in a fog of high-sounding phrases and protestations of a temporizing nature, with no more substance than the air they are breathed upon.

Unfortunately, in the past, expressions of idealism and friendship in the foreign policy of nations have frequently been regarded with suspicion as foreshadowing some gross and crafty design upon the sovereignty and well-being of other states. There is no reason why this must be the case; and it will cease to be so just as soon as we are prepared to hearken to the words of the Master, the finest definition of democracy: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with thy whole heart and with thy whole soul and with thy whole mind and with thy whole strength. This is the first commandment. And the second is like to it: Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" (Mark xii, 30, 31).

We of the Americas have much to be thankful for, and be it noted that our thanks goes forth, not to our own efforts or to some nameless force or human conception, but to Almighty God, the Giver of all good gifts.

Natural resources, boundless opportunities, freedom of activity, the vigor of youth—all these lie at our command. It is within our power to appreciate and use them as God has intended, sharing the good things of earth with a benediction on our lips. Working in spiritual harmony, symbolized so beautifully by the Christ of the Andes and of Corcovado, practicing the Faith that is within us, cooperating in the Christian brotherhood, laboring for human advance in line with the principles of Christ and for the objectives of Christ, we shall forge the destinies of a world that the Providence of God has not forgotten.

Contemporary Racism in America

VINCENT A. MCQUADE, O.S.A.

RRACE prejudice is not a new phenomena in the United States. Throughout our brief history it has disturbed our tranquillity in numerous ways. For the most part it is a movement which reaches its maximum development in times of stress and economic maladjustment, yet it is a phenomena present at all times among our citizens. Under the strains of a depression its manifestations frequently are more widespread, its excesses more severe.

In times of prosperity, during periods of emergency such as we are experiencing today, the severity of race prejudice generally is lessened. When the strength of a particular movement ebbs, the tendency to ascribe stereotyped characteristics to certain groups remains widespread. And thus it endures a plague to our social health, a barrier to a more complete and lasting national unity.

Under the impact of war, both as a non-participant and as a belligerent nation, racial antipathies have been further developed. Even the program of national defense failed to stifle the deeply rooted prejudice for the Negro. Discrimination against the Negro race both in defense industries and in the armed forces of our country has not aided our defense efforts. If they are continued, they will certainly hinder national unity and morale, both of which are requisites for a triumphal prosecution of the war.

In the present discussion, I am excluding the Negro problem from direct consideration. This is being done, not to minimize the seriousness of interracial relationships within this country, but to emphasize another aspect of the racial question which seems to demand

attention. Racial antipathies have been stirred in such a fashion that they may injure the future possibilities of a lasting peace, and perhaps seriously impair our own efforts to maintain national unity.

Since the war started in September, 1939, two significant developments have occurred within this country which are directly related to the question of racialism.

- 1) Anti-Semitism has been growing into a movement of significant proportions.
- 2) Set attitudes towards the peoples of the Axis nations have been engendered and, at present, under the impetus of war, these threaten to assume dangerous proportions.

Both of these movements represent what I would call an American variant of the various racial theories. While racial superiority is definitely rejected there seems to be present, especially in non-scientific circles, an attempt to represent and depict these groups as the possessors of undesirable traits and characteristics. In this connection it would be well to remember that this represents an acceptance of a racial theory; one which is clearly unsupportable and scientifically untenable.

The teaching of scientists on this question is quite definite. There is no evidence to show that one race is superior to another in innate abilities, nor is there any evidence to show that one race is inferior to another.

Numerous cultural differences exist, not merely among the three major divisions of the human race, but within any one race, indeed, within the limits of a country there are numerous cultural differences. As far as innate characteristics and abilities are concerned, to the best of our knowledge one race is just as good as another. It is interesting to quote the resolution of the American Anthropological Association, which was passed at their annual meeting in December, 1940.

Whereas anthropology is being conscripted to serve the cause of an unscientific racialism, this Association repudiates such racialism and adheres to the following statement of facts:

1. Anthropology provides no scientific basis for discrimination against any people on the ground of racial inferiority.
2. The terms Aryan and Semitic have no racial significance whatsoever. They simply denote linguistic families. Cammack, J. S., *The Church and Racialism*, CATHOLIC MIND, January 8, 1941.

In like manner it has been the traditional view of the Church that such theories cannot and should not receive acceptance from Catholics. There are numerous official statements which clearly indicate the position of the Church on this question. Let it suffice to call to mind the Encyclical letter of Pope Pius XI to the people of Germany, *The Situation of the Church in Germany*, in which he denounces the neo-paganism of the Nazi racial theories, characterizing them as an idolatrous cult, a manifest apostasy. This statement is, I believe, representative of the views expressed by Catholic authorities on this question.

Although the attitude of scientists toward racial theories is clear and definite, yet we encounter many persons imbued with anti-Semitic feelings. This is not a recent development but seems to have been present to some degree for many years.

During the depression of the last decade when Communism was considered a definite threat to our welfare, it was frequently asserted that practically all Communists were Jews. Previous to the start of hostilities in the present conflict, I have heard many individuals express the opinion that they believed the Nazis were justified in suppressing the Jews and imposing severe penalties upon them.

With the start of the war, there occurred a gradual change in American attitudes. As our opinions and feelings changed from strict neutrality to those of belligerent neutrality, the question of anti-Semitism became quite pronounced. To understand this development properly, we must briefly review the changes that

occurred in American feelings and evaluate their influence on this question.

In the early days of the European conflict, indeed right up to the time of the attack on Pearl Harbor, a substantial group of citizens believed that America would be wise to avoid all foreign entanglements. Many of these individuals, sincere, honest and patriotic Americans, believed that a policy of strict neutrality would be the best program; a policy which would have treated the belligerents equally. The other extreme was to be found among those who advocated immediate intervention in the war. Between these two extremes, a large segment of the American population remained, undecided, bewildered and perhaps a bit confused.

In the course of time as the aggressive acts of the Axis powers increased in number and violence, the interventionist viewpoint grew in strength. As we increased our aid to Britain, repealed the neutrality act and openly proclaimed our hopes and belief in her ultimate triumph, the press, radio and motion pictures became more pronounced in their presentation of propaganda against the Totalitarian powers. Not only was aid for Britain favored, but agitation for American participation or intervention in the conflict received an ever widening acceptance.

During this time the isolationists experienced great difficulty in presenting their views. Press reports of their meetings were sketchy, inadequate and sometimes biased in their presentation. Moreover, a few of the isolationists were perhaps more interested in disseminating anti-Semitic propaganda than they were in fostering isolationist viewpoints and accepted the latter merely as a shield to conceal their true activities.

Under these circumstances, many well intentioned persons were misled by a superficial view of the situation. As they witnessed their views and convictions gradually declining in public favor, they were easily convinced that the lack of radio time, the inadequate

press reports, the difficulty in hiring meeting halls, all of these were due to the machinations of the Jews. After all, did not the Jews control the movies, and hold a dominating interest over the radio and newspapers, and in this fashion prevent the isolationists from receiving a hearing? Were not the Jewish leaders in this country straining every sinew and muscle to bring about intervention in order to overthrow the governments who were oppressing their fellow-religionists? America must enter the war, because that was the only way to defeat Hitler and his cohorts; and such a defeat was necessary if the persecution of racial minorities was to be stopped.

Thus the argument developed and in its wake there arose the spectre of anti-Semitism. The Jews were well aware of this situation. The *Saturday Evening Post* for December 6, 1941 carried a leading article on the question by Jerome Frank, *Red, White and Blue Her-ring*. This situation gave every indication of developing into a critical and dangerous movement when the dramatic and unexpected attack at Pearl Harbor forced war on the United States, and at least temporarily quieted the situation.

If war had come in any other manner, I fear that we would experience great difficulty in uniting the nation. Undoubtedly, many would have attributed our entrance to the influence of a non-Aryan racial minority in our midst. However, since the Japanese attacked, this question has ceased to be pressing.

I have considered this aspect of the question even though at present it is dormant, because in all probability it will be of importance in the future. In this connection it would be well to remember that as Catholics, anti-Semitism cannot have a place in our thoughts. The *Osservatore Romano* in 1939 stated the Catholic position as follows: "Propaganda against the Jews assumes, wherever it is organized and led, proportions unworthy of twenty centuries of Christian civilization."

Of greater importance is the letter issued by the Sacred Congregation of Studies on April 13, 1938. Addressed to the Catholic seminaries and universities of the world, they were urged to arm themselves stoutly to refute the absurd doctrines of racialism. Among the doctrines enumerated for refutation were the following two which are representative samples of the group specifically mentioned.

The principal end of education is to perfect the natural constitution of the race and to fire the mind with a burning love of one's race, as the greatest good.

Vigor of race and purity of blood must be conserved and fostered at any cost; and whatever leads to this end is by that very fact justifiable. (*Ibid.*)

Now is the time to present the factual materials which would once and for all refute this allegation. Under conditions of adversity, tolerance is likely to give way to blind hatred, especially if aroused and directed by organized propaganda. Let effective measures be undertaken before any organized group used this as a pretext to disrupt national unity and engender internal disturbances which would definitely injure us in the present situation.

The second aspect of the topic refers to contemporary attitudes towards our war opponents. I believe that we are all familiar with the racial theories of German National Socialism. It is well to observe that Italy has adopted and operated a similar program, although it has not been enforced as radically as in Germany. Japan, like the other Totalitarian powers, is striving to enforce a similar program in the Orient. In passing we might observe that since Japan has declared war, Italy has discovered a racial affinity with the Japanese. According to the Italian radio, the Japanese are "yellow Aryans."

Theories of racial superiority are not new to the world. Their modern development flows from the works of Count A. de Gobineau and H. S. Chamberlain. A substantial group of writers have supported and advo-

cated their objectives. The modern exponents are well illustrated in the writings of Rosenberg and indeed it seems that such views constitute an ideal foundation for the development of the absolute state. Rosenberg's work, *The Myth of the Twentieth Century*, logically follows and develops Chamberlain's writings, and is the gospel of Nazism.

On the whole, acceptance of such theories has been rare within this country, the more common occurrence is rejection. However, in rejecting such theories some have gone to the opposite extreme and accepted, implicitly or explicitly, a theory which characterized the Axis peoples as inferior. The Germans have an "ingrained militarism," they have a "long-thwarted German desire for recognition as a superior people"; they are "cruel," arrogant," etc. It is common to ridicule the Italian military strength, while their military strategy is scornfully derided. The Japanese are "the yellow peril threatening the civilized world of today." (P. van Paassen, *Days of Our Years*). In the recent past there was a strong tendency to look down upon Japanese technical and military ability. The under-rating of Japanese skills had an unfortunate denouement at Pearl Harbor. In brief, our opponents are characterized as being definitely inferior and the possessors of undesirable innate traits.

The evidence supporting this particular type of presentation, written, verbal and visual, is weak and inaccurate: scientifically, it is to be placed in the same category as the various theories of racial superiority. To attribute differences to cultural conditioning would logically demand recognition. However, when we discuss "ingrained traits," "natural inabilities," "naturally cruel," etc., it seems that we are definitely overstepping the boundaries of cultural influences and subscribing to another variant of the racial theories.

Propaganda of this type has no place among the American people. We are not fighting a "yellow race

peri
our
defe
belie
of r
need
alize
will
let
furt
It
this
help
to t
cha
I
look
raci
Axi
wou
Suc
abi
see
ove
suc
the
wit
inj
I
leg
pre
mu
tw
tio
T
peo
T
into
cer

peril," we are not striving to compel others to accept our democratic way of living. We are striving to defend our own rights, our heritage of liberty, our belief in freedom for the individual, our acceptance of man's natural rights. In doing this, we do not need nor do we want such theories to further emotionalize our feelings and hinder our reason. The war will inflame passions; deepest emotions will be stirred: let us not add the fuel of race prejudice to conceal further the issues involved in this conflict.

It is necessary to maintain our sense of balance on this issue because at some future time, and with God's help we pray that it will be soon, peace will again come to the world. With the help of God it will be a just, charitable and lasting peace.

If we have accustomed ourselves, as a nation, to look down upon our opponents, if we have embraced a racial theory which would belittle the people of the Axis nations, the chances are that such antipathies would find a concrete expression in the peace treaty. Such a happening would be a sad commentary on our abilities. While peace was ostensibly established, the seeds of future conflicts would be sown liberally. Moreover, an added reason may be considered. If we accept such theories, there is always the danger of projecting them upon those people of German or Italian descent within our own country. This would be hurtful and injurious to the country, whether at peace or at war.

Pope Pius XII in his Christmas Address to the College of Cardinals December 24, 1940, laid down five prerequisites as the essentials of the new order which must be established at the end of the war. The first two prerequisites refer specifically to the racial question. These are:

Triumph over hate, which is today a cause of division among peoples . . .

Triumph over mistrust, which bears down as a depressing weight on international law and renders impossible the realization of any sincere agreement.

The remaining three call for the establishing of justice in economic life and the practice of religion in every day life.

Triumph over the distressing principles that utility is a basis of law and right, and that might makes right.

Triumph over those germs of conflict which consist in two-sided differences in the field of world economy.

Triumph over the spirit of cold egoism which fearless in its might, easily leads to violation not only of the honor and sovereignty of states but of the righteous, wholesome and disciplined liberty of citizens as well.—CATHOLIC MIND, January 8, 1941.

In concluding the Pope declared :

We express Our heartfelt wish that humanity and those who will show it the way along which it is to move forward will be sufficiently matured intellectually and capable in action to prepare the ground of the future for the new order that will be solid, true and just. (*Ibid.*)

Our immediate attention could profitably be directed toward a program which would effectively counteract the present trend in racial attitudes. Lasting peace can never be established until such feelings are definitely eradicated. Their absence will not guarantee peace, but their presence makes a lasting peace impossible.

Some Things New and Old

JESUIT "MONKS"

Recently I read in a newspaper that "Jesuit monks" were engaged in a certain spiritual work. Are the Jesuits monks? I have never heard them called monks before.

No, the Jesuits are not monks, and nothing but the most abyssmal ignorance of a newspaper writer could cause that writer to give a member of the Society of Jesus such a designation. In technical language the Jesuits, that is, Jesuit priests, belong to the religious category known as Clerks Regular. That means clerics or clergy who live according to a rule of life approved by the Holy See.

Speaking generally, there are three kinds of male Religious Orders in the Church: Monks, Friars, Clerks Regular. Of these, two form what is roughly known as the Monastic Orders. That is, they live in monasteries and by their constitutions they have the obligation of choir: which means that they are obliged by rule to recite the Divine Office as a community in choir.

Now the Jesuits, on the other hand, are obligated to the recitation of the Divine Office, but not in choir. They fulfil their obligation by reciting the Breviary privately.

But the Jesuits, whilst they are not monks, share with the monks and friars the canonical right of being a Religious Order. That is, their members take Solemn Vows. And it is this difference of taking Solemn or Simple Vows which distinguishes between an Order and a Congregation—for in the Religious Congregations the Simple Vows only are administered to their subjects. Hence, whilst Jesuits are in no sense monks, because they are not members of a Monastic Order; by their Solemn Vows they belong to one of the Orders of Pontifical Right, and enjoy that ecclesiastical standing and precedence which monks and friars also hold.

RADIO INDULGENCE

I am told that a Plenary Indulgence may be gained by radio listeners. Is that so?

Yes, that is so. According to the Decree *Iam pridem*, issued by the Sacred Apostolic Penitentiary on June 15, 1939 and published in the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, the Faithful may gain by radio the Plenary Indulgence granted by the Supreme Pontiff when he imparts the Papal Benediction *Urbi et Orbi*—to the city and the world.

Now that does not mean that anyone hearing the Holy Father impart the Papal Benediction over the radio, by that very fact gains the Indulgence. Far

from it. This Indulgence is very carefully safeguarded, and the main condition is that those who hear the Papal Benediction must be in the same spiritual condition as if they were present in person in Rome when the Holy Father is blessing Rome and the world.

In other words, any Catholic who hears the Pope impart the Papal Benediction by radio, and who wishes to gain the Indulgence, must fulfil the customary conditions: Confession, Holy Communion, a visit to a church and prayers for the Holy Father's intention.

With these four conditions fulfilled, and the radio heard with a fitting reverence and devotion, any Catholic may gain the Plenary Indulgence just as if he (or she) were bodily present when His Holiness imparts the Papal Benediction.

And, moreover, this concession applies only when the Supreme Pontiff in person, on special occasions, imparts the Apostolic Benediction to the entire world.

UGANDA MARTYRS

Who are the Martyrs of Uganda, and are there any churches in the United States dedicated in their honor?

The Uganda Martyrs were twenty-two pages of the royal court of Mwanga, king of Uganda in Africa, who suffered death under the most excruciating torture rather than deny the Catholic Faith, which they had received at the hands of the French White Fathers.

These Martyrs suffered for the Faith in 1885 and 1886, being burned alive after enduring the most terrible tortures that the malice of an African chieftain could devise. The youngest of these glorious Confessors for the Faith was Kizito, a boy of about fourteen years of age, who with his companions was burned alive on a great pyre at Namugongo in Uganda.

On June 6, 1920 these African witnesses to the True Faith, after their Cause had been examined and ap-

prov
Pope
God
of ex
hund
Cath
fessi
by
Pres
youn
after
TH
color
Mart
dedic
Fran
Tuls
of th
Mart
pres

W
freq
TH
Cath
It i
Cath
only
TH
exer
all C
Auth
Mor
So
spea
his

proved by the Sacred Congregation, were beatified by Pope Benedict XV. These glorious youths died praising God amid their torments, and their wonderful example of endurance was the cause for inspiration to many hundreds of thousands of loyal and faithful colored Catholics in Uganda today. The story of their confession is told in *The Twenty-Two Martyrs of Uganda* by Archbishop Strecher, published by the Paulist Press in New York. In 1936 the mother of one of these young martyrs was baptized a Catholic, fifty years after her son had given his life for the Faith.

There are several churches in the United States in colored parishes dedicated in honor of the Blessed Martyrs of Uganda. The first of these churches so dedicated was established by the Most Reverend Francis Clement Kelley, Bishop of Oklahoma City and Tulsa, on October 7, 1925. This church possesses one of the only two authentic first-class relics of the Blessed Martyrs of Uganda known to exist. The other relic is preserved in Rome.

EX CATHEDRA

What is meant by the term Ex Cathedra, which frequently occurs in Catholic statements?

The term *Ex Cathedra* is part of the phrase *Ex Cathedra Petri*, meaning "From the Chair of Peter." It is strictly an ecclesiastical term and entirely Catholic in meaning, and connected with one person only, the Pope.

The Pope is said to speak *Ex Cathedra* when he exercises his office as the Shepherd and Teacher of all Christians, and by virtue of his Supreme Apostolic Authority, he defines a doctrine concerning Faith and Morals which is to be held by the whole Church.

So when the Pope speaks *Ex Cathedra*, he is not speaking as a private theologian; he is not expressing his personal opinions either on history or sociology

or anything else. He is defining a doctrine that has been Divinely revealed, and furthermore is in accordance with the true intention of Holy Scripture.

And when the Pope speaks *Ex Cathedra* his teaching is, in real fact, binding on *all* baptized Christians, although the validity of his utterance is accepted only by Catholics—sometimes called Roman Catholics.

The word *cathedra* itself means the chair or throne of the bishop in his cathedral church. But in the Papal sense it has the additional meaning of the seat of authoritative teaching, that is, the Chair of Peter.

IRISH MILITARY CHAPLAINS

Are there any Irish priests serving with the British armed forces?

There are, indeed, quite a few. As Vatican Radio said last November, the Irish Bishops have not hesitated for the spiritual benefit of many Catholic soldiers to place a goodly number of priests at the disposal of the Ordinary of the English Army, the Right Reverend James Dey, titular Bishop of Sebastopolis.

At the last reckoning there were 384 priests serving with the British army, navy and air force. And of these ninety-four are priests born in Ireland, and seventy-one of Irish parentage born in the British Isles—a total of 165 Irish chaplains, more than one-third of the Catholic chaplains.

The Vicar-General for the Army is Colonel the Right Reverend Monsignor John Goghlan of the diocese of Meath. Lieutenant Colonel the Rev. Joseph P. Stapleton is of the diocese of Ossory, and Major the Rev. Matthew O'Carroll is of the diocese of Kilmore. And, by the way, the only Catholic chaplains who so far have been awarded decorations during this war happen to be Irish priests.